DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 002 CG 028 469

AUTHOR Reed, Jocelyn G.; Feibus, Mary L.; Rosenfield, Sylvia
TITLE A Conceptual Framework for Choosing Social Skills Programs.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists (30th, Orlando, FL, April 14-18, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Evaluation; Elementary Education; *Emotional Adjustment; *Interpersonal Competence; Program Evaluation; *Social Development

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a data-based, conceptual framework to assist researchers and practitioners in choosing programs that promote social and emotional competence in elementary school children. The following topics are addressed: (1) how the conceptual frameworks researched were chosen; (2) the utility of each framework; (3) description of the social skills programs; (4) analyses of the social skills programs within the frameworks; (5) results of the study. Existing frameworks appropriate for the evaluation of social skills training programs are reviewed; a two-tiered conceptual framework is developed providing an understanding of the specific programs within a larger context. The following approaches were evaluated and fit into the model: Adelman's comprehensive full service model; Ladd and Mize's social cognitive learning model; Elias and Clabby's model of social decision-making and problem solving skills for social skill training. Three social skills training programs were evaluated: (1) Interpersonal Cognitive Problem Solving; (2) The Tough Kid - Social Skills Book; (3) Skillstreaming the Elementary School Child. States that school personnel should pre-determine the behavioral outcomes they wish to achieve through the training and whether they would like to achieve this goal on an individual, classroom-wide, or school-wide basis before entering the model to select a program. (EMK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Running head: Conceptual Framework

ED 420 002

A Conceptual Framework For Choosing Social Skills Programs

Jocelyn G. Reed, MSEd
Mary L. Feibus, MA
Sylvia Rosenfield, Ph.D.
University of Maryland

Poster presented at the Annual meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists, April, 1998, Orlando, Florida

CG028469

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Feibus

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

Abstract

This paper provides a conceptual framework to assist researchers and practitioners in choosing programs that promote social and emotional competence in elementary school age children. In our two-tiered conceptual framework, the broadest piece is Adelman's (1996) comprehensive full service model. This model incorporates 6 enabling components. Our point of entry is the classroom focused enabling component. The second tier has two models specific to training social skills: Ladd and Mize (1983) and Elias and Clabby (1992). Ladd and Mize provide a social-cognitive learning model of social skills training. This model incorporates theory and evaluation data to provide a three step training procedure. Elias and Clabby's work provides three phases for teaching social awareness and social problem solving. A major difference between these models is the unit of change the training is intended to effect. It is within this framework that we evaluate three widely recognized social skills training programs (ICPS, Tough Kid, and Skillstreaming). Our results indicate that while all three of the social skills programs fit into various aspects of each model, Skillstreaming appears to most closely approximate the framework proposed by Ladd and Mize. The most effective way for school personnel to determine the appropriateness of a particular social skills training program is to examine the program through frameworks similar to those of Ladd and Mize and of Elias and Clabby. School personnel should pre-determine: 1) the behavioral outcomes they wish to achieve through the training and 2) whether they would like to achieve this goal on an individual, classroom-wide, or school-wide basis.

A Conceptual Framework for Choosing Social Skills Programs

Social skills training programs are commonly used in elementary schools to affect positive behavior change and prevent negative behavior in children (e.g., Elias & Branden, 1988). However, the literature suggests that school psychologists and other school personnel responsible for choosing programs, have difficulty selecting the appropriate program to meet the needs of the children (Sugai & Fuller, 1991). Schools often base these decisions on convenience and familiarity, rather than on data supporting the effectiveness of the program for the school's population and issues. The purpose of this research is to provide schools with a data-based, conceptual framework to assist in this decision making process. This paper will address the following: 1) how the conceptual frameworks were chosen; 2) the utility of each framework; 3) descriptions of the social skills programs; 4) analyses of the social skills programs within the frameworks; and 5) results of our study.

The first step in this research was to select existing frameworks that are appropriate for the evaluation of social skills training programs. The idea was to have multiple tiers that fit together, allowing an understanding of the programs within a larger context. The most inclusive tier was Adelman's (1996) comprehensive full service model. Adelman's model focused on aspects of the school and home. Fitting within the inclusive tier of Adelman's model, we chose two frameworks that focused on the specifics of developing and training social skills (Ladd & Mize, 1983) and social competence (Elias & Clabby, 1992) in children. The rubric used to select frameworks was the relevance and the availability of supporting data. Frameworks were selected if a research base existed and if the components of the framework were relevant to social competence and social skills training programs. Both frameworks are considered relevant to the area of training social skills and were data based. These models have different foci, which in turn helped highlight the differences in the specific training programs. The specific training programs chosen were 1) Interpersonal Cognitive Problem Solving: Kindergarten and primary grades (ICPS) (Shure, 1992); 2) Tough Kid – Social Skills Book (Sheridan, 1996); and 3) Skillstreaming the elementary school child (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997). These programs were chosen because of their wide spread use.

Adelman's (1996) comprehensive full service model

School reform has become a highlighted topic in this current day and age. Problems such as school violence, the overreferral of culturally/ethnically different students to special education, and the lack of academic success as measured by scholastic standardized examinations are issues with which school psychologists regularly grapple. However, while wide spread recognition exists that these issues need resolution, little attention is paid to the type of school support services and programs that could be provided to change some of the crises facing our schools. One model that deals with providing social and academic services to assist children and their parents is Howard Adelman's (1996) comprehensive full service model. Adelman's model moves beyond a full service model that primarily focuses on the "development of mechanisms to enhance service access, improve case management, coordinate resources, reduce redundancy, and increase efficacy" (p. 433). The full service model has several limitations because its focus is to increase community services by bringing these services from the outside, into the school. This emphasis of bringing services from the outside into the school can create tension among school personnel who may feel threatened due to being required to link up with "outsiders." Adelman's model

accomplishes what the full service model did not because it examines different intervention components including: 1) classroom-focused enabling; 2) student and family assistance; 3) community outreach/volunteers; 4) home involvement in schooling; 5) support for transition; and 6) crisis/emergency assistance and prevention. Resource coordination is the central component of these enabling areas.

The point of entry for our two-tiered model is the classroom-focused enabling component. The classroom-focused enabling component was chosen because of its emphasis on "enhancing classroom-based efforts to enable learning by increasing teacher effectiveness for preventing and handling problems in the classroom" (Adelman, 1996, p. 437). One way to address classroom problems is by increasing students' social problem solving and social competence skills. Interventions such as Interpersonal Cognitive Problem Solving (ICPS) (Shure, 1992), Tough Kid – Social Skills Book (Sheridan, 1996), and Skillstreaming (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997) aid in decreasing social conflict among children by teaching social problem solving skills. Adelman's classroom-focused enabling component examines barriers to learning by helping to enhance healthy development.

Adelman's comprehensive full service model provides the broadest aspect of our conceptual mode (see Fig. 1). From this model, we move to two frameworks that focus more directly on developing and training social skills/competence in children.

Ladd & Mize (1983) and Elias & Clabby (1992)

The work of Ladd and Mize (1983) and Elias and Clabby (1992) is used as a framework to help evaluate specific social skills training programs. Ladd and Mize provide a social-cognitive learning model of social skills training. This model identifies three basic training objectives that are within the cognitive-social learning theory (Bandura, 1977). The three basic training objectives are 1) enhancing skill concepts, 2) promoting skill performance, and 3) fostering skill maintenance/generalization. The model provides training procedures and specific steps for accomplishing each objective. We chose this model as one portion of our framework because 1) it was developed to do so, and 2) the authors incorporate theory and evaluation data in its development. In addition, the utility of this model has been recognized by other researchers (e.g., Elias & Branden, 1988).

Ladd and Mize's (1983) work is compared and contrasted to the work of Elias and Clabby (1992). Elias and Clabby provide three phases for teaching social awareness and social problem solving: 1) self-control skills, 2) social awareness and group participation skills, and 3) social decision-making and problem-solving skills. Teaching self-control skills helps children to "accurately process social information, delay behavior long enough to thoughtfully access one's social decision-making abilities and approach others in a way that avoids provoking their anger or annoyance" (Elias & Clabby, 1992, p. 16). Teaching social awareness and group participation skills are important because these skills "underlie the exercise of social responsibility and positive interactions in groups" (Elias & Clabby, 1992, p. 16). The social decision-making and problem solving skills "represent the cornerstone of [their] approach, [the skills] are incorporated into a sequential strategy that is used to understand, analyze and react to stressful and problematic situations and situations that involve meaningful choices and decisions" (Elias & Clabby, 1992, p. 17).

We chose this model as part of our framework for three primary reasons. First, unlike Ladd and Mize's model, which focuses on the unit of change as the child, Elias and Clabby's

model includes changes at the individual, class-wide, school-wide, and district level. Second, Elias and Clabby indicate their model was developed to address cross-cultural and diversity issues within schools. Third, the Elias and Clabby model highlight the importance "to generate a simplified skills array that would reflect panhistorical, cross-cultural, and long-term adaptation and be feasibly implementable with high quality in diverse school settings" (Elias & Clabby, 1992, p. 16).

Social skills training programs

The last level of our framework is the selection of three social skills training programs. Within the Ladd and Mize (1983) and Elias and Clabby (1992) frameworks, we evaluate three widely recognized social skills training programs. It was our intent to evaluate programs that are widely used and recognized in elementary schools. The programs chosen are Interpersonal Cognitive Problem Solving (ICPS) (Shure, 1992), The Tough Kid – Social Skills Book (Part of the "Tough Kid" Series by Rhode, Jenson, & Reavis) (Sheridan, 1996), and Skillstreaming the Elementary School Child (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997).

Interpersonal Cognitive Problem Solving (ICPS) – also known as I Can Problem Solve – was developed to teach children thinking skills to help evaluate and deal with interpersonal problems. The 83-lesson program teaches children how to think, not what to think. If the 20-minute lessons are conducted daily, the program takes approximately 4 months to complete. The program evaluated in this paper is for use with kindergarten and primary school aged children.

The Tough Kid – Social Skills Book is developed for use with children identified by peers and/or teachers as displaying maladaptive social behavior. The program helps school professionals identify "Tough Kids," assess social skills, and teach social skills to children in small (4-8 children), structured groups. The program was developed and tested on 8-12 year olds. The program was designed to be conducted weekly, with sessions lasting one hour, over the course of 10 weeks.

Skillstreaming the Elementary School Child examines the behavioral and other types of skills children need to get along with each other. The program makes the assumption that the learner is generally deficient in these skills. The goal is to teach these skills to children. There are nine key steps to learning the 101 skills identified in the Skillstreaming manual. The skills focus on helping the children get along with others and avoid conflict. The lessons last from 30-45 minutes. One of the authors of this paper is currently working on a project with an urban elementary school that is implementing Skillstreaming as a school-wide intervention.

Analyzing ICPS, Tough Kid, and Skillstreaming within the Elias & Clabby (1992) model

A more comprehensive understanding emerged about the three programs by evaluating them within the larger frameworks. This section will describe the general patterns that emerged from the evaluation. For a more detailed account, see Table 1. To facilitate cross-referencing with Table 1, the numbers and letters corresponding to the component headings are included in text.

First, both Skillstreaming and Elias and Clabby (1992) share a similar conceptual framework. Both Skillstreaming and Elias and Clabby incorporate elements of Bandura's social learning theory (1977) in their respective development. Skillstreaming uses modeling, social reinforcement, and behavioral rehearsal. Skillstreaming teaches children that they are the agents of resolving interpersonal conflict, a fact that is also inherent in Elias and Clabby's model. In

addition, when the overall definition of the three focal skills of Elias and Clabby's work is compared to the skills taught in Skillstreaming, similarities between the two are seen.

Component A

With regard to Component A of Elias and Clabby's model, both the Tough Kid and Skillstreaming programs concentrate on the micro-skills of this component. ICPS lacked explicit lessons in the first two components of Elias and Clabby's model on Self-Control Skills. Elias and Clabby may argue that by excluding the self-control skills, the prerequisites for learning social competence are not present and consequently the other lessons may not be as effectively learned. The Tough Kid program, unlike ICPS, devotes two full lessons (session #4 and session #7) to teaching self-control skills. The lessons that corresponded to Elias and Clabby's model were calming self under stress (skill 4) and carrying on a conversation without provoking others (skill 5). The Tough Kid program was developed for children who were identified because they were displaying signs of maladaptive behavior. The inclusion of these self-control skills may be due to a perceived need for these identified children. Similar to the micro-skills steps presented in Elias and Clabby's model, Skillstreaming provides a lesson on listening (skill 1) and on following instructions (skill 2). Children are also taught how to begin and end a conversation, which is similar to skill 3. There is no skill lesson, however, on calming oneself down.

Component B

Both ICPS and Tough Kid lacked training in Social Awareness and Group Participation Skills. This clearly shows the individual-level focus of these programs, rather than the group-wide change that Elias and Clabby advocate. Skillstreaming differs from ICPS and Tough Kid because of its inclusion of material from Component B. For example, Skillstreaming includes a lesson on "Accepting a Compliment," which is similar to skill 1, as well as on "Asking For Help" which is emphasized in skill.

Component C

Tough Kid and ICPS provided the best fit within Elias and Clabby's (1992) Social Decision-Making and Problem-Solving Skills. Skillstreaming did not share the same steps to reach these goals, as Elias and Clabby's model. ICPS has specific lessons about noticing signs of feelings (skill 11), identifying issues or problems (skill 12), and selecting the best solution (skill 16). In addition, generating alternative solutions (skill 14) and envisioning possible consequences (skill 15) are major elements of ICPS and covered in over 20 lessons. Similarly, Tough Kid devoted specific lessons to noticing signs of feelings (skill 11), identifying issues or problems (skill 12), generating alternative solutions (skill 14), envisioning possible consequences (skill 15), and selecting the best solution (skill 16). As part of the weekly meeting, the Tough Kid students develop and set goals (skill 13) with the instructor to work on the behavior learned in the lesson. Both ICPS and Tough Kid lacked an explicit lesson that taught children to plan and make a final check for potential obstacles (skill 17).

Skillstreaming did not teach a majority of the micro-skill steps offered in Elias and Clabby's model. For example, although Skillstreaming provides 10 lessons on "Skills for Dealing With Feelings," the other micro-skill steps identified in Component C are not explicitly discussed in the Skillstreaming curriculum. Despite the conceptual similarity between Elias and Clabby's Social-Decision Making and Problem-Solving Skills, and that of Skillstreaming, the specific steps and methods of teaching these skills is different.

Analyzing ICPS, Tough Kid, and Skillstreaming within the Ladd & Mize (1983) framework

In general, Skillstreaming appears to match the skill steps identified in this model more closely than either ICPS or Tough Kid. See table 2 for a more detailed analysis.

Step 1

ICPS and Tough Kid differ in the first step of Ladd and Mize's framework – Enhancing Skill Concepts (step 1). In general, the Tough Kid program tends to be more explicit than ICPS about how to enhance skill concepts. The Tough Kid lessons are directive in how the leader should explain the purpose of the program (Component A), give examples (Component C), promote rehearsal and recall of skill concepts (Component D), and refine and generalize the concept (Component E). ICPS includes these components as suggestions for what the instructor can do once the lesson is over, not as part of the scripted lesson. For example, the manual suggests that the instructor "Dialogue" with the children around ICPS concepts when related issues arise during the school day. This approach requires that 1) the instructor is in regular contact with the children, and 2) the instructor is sufficiently skilled in ICPS concepts to dialogue with the children outside of the lesson. Similar to Tough Kid, Skillstreaming emphasizes the skill concepts and utilizes the micro-steps identified in component A.

In both Tough Kid and ICPS, the instructor explicitly define the skill concept in terms of attributes (Component B). ICPS has approximately 40 lessons (almost half the program) devoted to teaching the pre-problem solving skills/vocabulary. The instructor teaches word concepts such as "or-and," "do-do not," and "fair-not fair" and feeling concepts such as "frustrated," "happy," and "mad." This ensures the children have the proper vocabulary and language for problem solving, recognizing feelings, and making decisions. The Tough Kid program does not have as comprehensive an approach to teaching the skill concepts in terms of its attributes. However, at the beginning of each lesson, time is spent with a definition and clarification of the skill. Alternatively, the Skillstreaming curriculum allows children to explain what *they* think the topic might mean. The Skillstreaming instructor then provides the correct definition for the skill topic being introduced and leads the children to identifying relevant and irrelevant attributes of the lesson being taught.

Step 2

Skillstreaming, ICPS, and the Tough Kid program also differ on step 2 of Ladd and Mize's model – Promoting Skill Performance. Skillstreaming utilizes each of the components identified in Promoting Skill Performance through contrived situations that the children choose. The instructor first models the skill steps that the children are to learn. Each child then rehearses the skill steps while working in dyads, and receives verbal feedback from the instructor after the co-actor and the group have responded to the main character's performance.

The Tough Kid program has many structures that allow the child to go successively from contrived situations to more real life situations. For example, similar to students in Skillstreaming groups, Tough Kid students are given the opportunity for guided rehearsal (Component A) through weekly role-plays, modeling, and feedback. Evaluation of the students' performance by the instructor (Component B) is conducted through the role-play and when the weekly goals are evaluated.

While Skillstreaming and Tough Kid provide explicit instruction in Components A and B, ICPS does not include as explicit support in those areas. The incorporation of these components in ICPS is largely due to the group size – in smaller groups, the instructor is more able to give

individual feedback and more students are likely to participate in role-plays. Neither ICPS nor Tough Kid allows for explicit instruction that supports fostering skill refinement and elaboration (Component C). This is obtainable in the Skillstreaming group.

Step 3

Again, the Skillstreaming and Tough Kid program adheres more closely than ICPS in the Fostering Skill Maintenance/Generalization (step 3) aspect of Ladd and Mize's model. However, unlike Skillstreaming, neither the Tough Kid nor ICPS programs include Fostering Self-evaluation and Skills Adjustment (Component C). In Skillstreaming, students are assigned homework where they are instructed to try the skills practiced during the session, in real life situations. The instructor and the student decide together when, how, and with whom the skills will be used. The homework assignments, in turn, allow the student to rate his/her performance of a skill. These assignments help the student self-monitor personal skill outcomes as the skill growth progresses. The ICPS program falters on this general area because of the jump between learning the ICPS skills in the lesson setting to using those skills in the "real world." The manual has a Complementary Applications section that suggests how children can use the skills in the classroom situation. This differs from Skillstreaming, which makes the inclusion of this component at the instructor's discretion. Alternatively, the Tough Kid program allows for role-plays, semi-structured play, goal setting, behavior contracts, and instructor/peer evaluation of behavior. All of these activities increase the skill generalization to other settings beyond the group.

Results

This research has evaluated three social skills programs within two frameworks that are relevant to such programs. The results suggest that while each of the three programs chosen fit into various aspects of our framework, Skillstreaming appears to most closely approximate the model of Ladd and Mize. The general skills identified by Ladd and Mize (e.g., Enhancing Skill Concepts), as well as many of the more specific skills (e.g., providing an advanced organizer) are skills that are emphasized in the Skillstreaming curriculum. The Skillstreaming program does not provide a good fit with Elias and Clabby's model because the emphasis of Skillstreaming is on changing the skill deficit in the individual child through group work. Elias and Clabby's model focuses on making broader, classroom-wide, school-wide, and district-wide changes. Additionally, many of the micro-skills identified in Elias and Clabby, particularly with regard to Component C, are not emphasized in the Skillstreaming curriculum.

As previously indicated, one of the authors is currently working in an elementary school located in an urban setting, that has attempted to implement Skillstreaming into the classroom curriculum. The results thus far are mixed. The primary problem appears to be related to the issue of time. Skillstreaming teaches 60 different skill lessons that should be taught to groups of students no larger than 8, for approximately 30-45 minutes. However, the manual does not clearly indicate whether Skillstreaming should be implemented classwide. The McGinnis and Goldstein (1997, p. 11) note that "...it is our hope based on beginning efforts to do so that Skillstreaming will find its place in the required school curriculum, both at the building and district levels." Some teachers have struggled to successfully implement Skillstreaming into their curriculum on a weekly basis, while other teachers focus more on Character Education lessons (lessons that emphasize similar skills as Skillstreaming, such as how to get along better with others) and attempt to implement Skillstreaming when time permits. In order for Skillstreaming

to be a successful intervention or prevention tool, as with any program, treatment integrity must be considered. The identified school chose Skillstreaming by word-of-mouth. This method of choosing and implementing social skills programs and/or any other types of intervention/prevention models is not specific to this school; this method is a relatively common experience. Not surprisingly, the needs of the school and the intent of the program are not congruent.

Discussion

Our research was developed to provide a two-tiered conceptual framework for assisting school personnel in making decisions regarding the appropriateness of a social skills training program for a particular school. In our broadest level, we utilized Adelman's (1996) comprehensive full service model which examines different intervention components including: 1) classroom-focused enabling; 2) student and family assistance; 3) community outreach/volunteers; 4) home involvement in schooling; 5) support for transition; and 6) crisis/emergency assistance and prevention. We chose the classroom focused enabling component because as school psychologists, this is a primary area of interest. The next level of our framework was two models specific to social skills training programs: Ladd and Mize (1983) and Elias and Clabby (1992). These models were chosen based on their relevance to social skills programs, as well as the availability of supporting data. Research was used to develop both models. Within the two models, we analyze three widely recognized social skills training programs (Interpersonal Cognitive Problem Solving, Tough Kid, and Skillstreaming). This was done to better understand the similarities and differences between the programs and the chosen models.

Our results indicate that Skillstreaming matches the Ladd and Mize model more closely than the other social skills programs examined. The general skill concepts as well as the micro-skills identified in Ladd and Mize's work are skills that are generally emphasized in the Skillstreaming curriculum. In addition, this model focuses on the individual child, which is also the primary focus of Skillstreaming. While Skillstreaming fits into aspects of the Elias and Clabby model, the match is not very close. This is particularly true in terms of the unit of change. While Skillstreaming can be implemented school-wide, given the time constraints, it appears to be most appropriate for small groups of children, with emphasis on building the skill level of the individual child. Thus, the school-wide change advocated by Elias and Clabby does not fit with the Skillstreaming program.

While identifying the most appropriate social skills training program may be a time consuming task, it is not an impossible endeavor. Schools should first pre-determine the behavioral outcome they would like to achieve and whether they would like to achieve this goal on an individual, classroom-wide or school-wide basis. This should be decided prior to selecting a social skills program. The program should then be examined through a framework similar to Ladd and Mize and Elias and Clabby. While the authors are aware that social skills training programs can be examined through other frameworks, it is strongly recommended that the framework(s) chosen be researched-based.

References:

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Elias, M.J., & Branden, L.R. (1988). Primary prevention of behavioral and emotional problems in school-aged populations. *School Psychology Review, 17(4),* 581-592.

Elias, M. J., & Clabby, J. (1992). *Building social problem solving skills.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ladd, G., & Mize, J. (1983). A cognitive-social learning model of social skill training. *Psychological Review, 90(2),* 127-157.

McGinnis, E., & Goldstein, A. (1997). *Skillstreaming the elementary school child.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Sheridan, S. (1996). *The Tough Kid social skills book – Part of the "Tough Kid" Series by Rhode, Jenson, & Reavis.* Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Shure, M. (1992). *I Can Problem Solve – An Interpersonal Cognitive Problem-Solving Program for kindergarten and primary grades.* Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Sugai, G., & Fuller, M. (1991). A decision model for social skills curriculum analysis. *Remedial and Special Education, 12(4),* 33-42.

Table 1. Social Decision-Making and Problem-Solving (Elias & Clabby, 1992)

Program	A) Self-control skills – *"These skills are necessary to accurately process social information, delay behavior long enough to thoughtfully access one's social decision-making abilities, and approach others in a way that avoids provoking their anger or annoyance"* (Elias & Clabby, 1992, p. 16).	1) Listening carefully and accurately	2) Remembering and following directions	3) Concentrating and following through on tasks
ICPS (Shure, 1992)	These specific skills are generally not emphasized in the structured lessons of ICPS. One lesson does focus on the importance of listening – however, with the emphasis on appropriately responding to the other person.	Lesson 20 "Are you listening to me?" teaches the importance of listening and responding to what someone else is saying.	Not explicitly.	Not explicitly
Tough Kid (Sheridan, 1996)	Session 7 is devoted to self-control – its importance, how to use it, and what it means.	Not explicitly.	Not explicitly.	Not explicitly.
Skillstreaming (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997)	Skillstreaming teaches skill steps to students to help maintain self-control and delay behavior so that they can identify the steps leading to a skill that will help them to respond in a more socially appropriate manner.	The first lesson teaches the skill steps necessary to listen appropriately.	Not explicitly.	Students are not explicitly taught to calm themselves down while attempting to identify the appropriate skill steps to take, although this skill can be modeled in any of the skills lessons.

Table 1. Social Decision-Making and Problem-Solving (Elias & Clabby, 1992)
(A- Self-control skills, con't and B-Social awareness and group participation skills)

Program	4) Calming self when under stress	5) Carrying on a conversation without upsetting or provoking others	B) Social awareness and group participation skills – *"These skills that underlie the exercise of social responsibility and positive interactions in groups. They include learning how to recognize and elicit trust, help, and praise from others; recognize others' perspectives; choose friends; and share, wait, and participate in groups"* (Elias & Clabby, 1992, p. 16).	6) Accept praise or approval
ICPS (Shure, 1992)	Not explicitly. However, several lessons teach a "feeling" vocabulary (e.g., worried, relieved, impatient) so that children are aware of words to describe their stress-related feelings.	Not explicitly.	ICPS is focused on individuals learning skills to be used for problem-solving in social situations. It does not focus on group dynamics, as this component does. However, the argument could be made that the ICPS skills could be transferable for more effective group participation and social awareness.	Not explicitly.
Tough Kid (Sheridan, 1996)	Session 7 teaches steps for using self-control, when to use it, and why it's important.	Session 4 teaches how to have a conversation, explains what a conversation is, the importance of conversing, and do's and dont's of having a conversation.	The goal of Tough Kid is for children to learn to make and keep friends and get along better with others. However, the skills taught in this program to achieve that goal are different from those in the Elias & Clabby framework.	Not explicitly.
Skillstreaming (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997)	Students are not explicitly taught to calm themselves down while attempting to identify the appropriate skill steps to take, although this skill can be modeled in any of the skills lessons.	Lesson 15 and 16 are Beginning a Conversation and Ending a Conversation.	Rules of the group are decided upon prior to the beginning of the group, so that the children have clear expectations of what will be required of them during the group. Students are given an opportunity to respond to various problems posed to the group.	Lesson 22 discusses how to accept a compliment.

Table 1. Social Decision-Making and Problem-Solving (Elias & Clabby, 1992)
(B-Social awareness and group participation skills, con't and C - Social decision-making and problem- solving skills)

Program	7) Choose praiseworthy and caring friends	8) Know when help is needed	9) Ask for help when needed	10) Work as part of a problem-solving team	C) Social decision-making and problem- solving skills – *"These skills, which represent the cornerstone of our approach, are incorporated into a sequential strategy that is used to understand, analyze, and react to stressful and problematic situations and situations that involve meaningful choices or decisions"* (Elias & Clabby, 1992, p. 17)	11) Noticing signs of feelings
ICPS (Shure, 1992)	Not explicitly.	Not explicitly.	Not explicitly.	Problem solving is taught to be done individually.	These skills are more closely aligned with the ICPS program than were components A and B.	Several lessons teach how to notice signs of feelings in others. e.g., Lessons 15, 16, 17 – children learn ways of identifying happy and sad feelings in others.
Tough Kid (Sheridan, 1996)	Not explicitly.	Not explicitly.	Not explicitly.	Problem solving is taught to be done individually.	These skills are important with the Tough Kid program.	Session 3 teaches children to recognize and express feelings in an appropriate manner.
Skillstreaming (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997)	Not addressed.	Not addressed.	Not explicitly.	Not explicitly.	Only a few of these skills are addressed in the Skillstreaming program.	Feelings are not the main focus of Skillstreaming. However, Lesson 26 deals with Knowing Your Feelings.

Table 1. Social Decision-Making and Problem-Solving (Elias & Clabby, 1992)
(C - Social decision-making and problem- solving skills, con't)

Program	12) Identifying issues or problems	13) Determining and selecting goals	14) Generating alternative solutions	15) Envisioning possible consequences
ICPS (Shure, 1992)	This is covered within the context of teaching alternative solutions to problems. e.g., lesson 55 "Guess the Problem." It is also covered in lesson 76 within the context of teaching children to find out what the problem is, instead of making assumptions. It is also a major element in the Solution-Consequence Pairs lessons.	This is not explicit. However, children are taught how to generate alternate solutions to problems – and this becomes their goal.	This is strongly covered and a major element of ICPS. At least 13 separate lessons cover the skills of finding the problem and figuring out many solutions to the problem.	This is a major element and covered in at least 23 lessons.
Tough Kid (Sheridan, 1996)	Session 6 teaches problem identification and associated feelings as the second step to problem solving.	Each week, children select goals and develop behavior contracts as part of the weekly lesson. These are reviewed the following week.	Session 6 teaches children to identify at least three choices to address the problem as the third step to problem solving.	Session 6 teaches children to think about choices and their consequences as the third step to problem solving.
Skillstreaming (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997)	Children are to attempt to identify the social problem so they can know which skill to apply to their situation.	This only occurs during the homework assignments when children, along with the instructor decide when, where, and with whom they will practice a new skill.	Not explicitly.	Not explicitly.

Table 1. Social Decision-Making and Problem-Solving (Elias & Clabby, 1992)
(C - Social decision-making and problem- solving skills, con't)

Program	16) Selecting best solution	17) Planning and making a final check for obstacles	18) Noticing what happened and using the information for future decision making and problem solving
ICPS (Shure, 1992)	Covered as a component of the consequential thinking lessons. It differs because it teaches the children to choose a good solution, not necessarily the best solution.	Not covered.	Lesson 80 teaches children to evaluate whether or not a solution was successful. However, the link to future decision-making is not made.
Tough Kid (Sheridan, 1996)	Session 6 teaches children to decide on their best choice as the fourth step to problem solving.	Not covered.	This is possible, although not absolute. After Session 6, students are assigned homework to practice problem solving. Goals and behavior contracts are set around the homework. The following week, the homework (goals and behavior contracts) can be discussed. A skillful leader can help the facilitate the children making connections between their problem solving behavior and the success of the behavior.
Skillstreaming (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997)	Not explicitly.	Not covered.	Not explicitly.

Table 2. A cognitive-social learning model of social-skills training (Ladd & Mize, 1983)
(Enhancing skill concepts – step 1)

Program	Enhancing skill concepts (step 1) – Get child to want to engage, explain the value of learning the skills	A) Establishing an intent to learn the skill concept	* Providing an advanced organizer, purpose for learning	* Stressing the functional relevance of the concept – why learning the skill is important
ICPS (Shure, 1992)	Says what it does, but not *why* it's good and important. Not a clear purpose that would motivate the children to be engaged.	Not explicitly stated within the lessons or introduction.	Touched on in the introduction (e.g., teaching about feelings and how to solve problems). This is not included in the lessons.	Touched on in the introduction, but not explicitly stated as to why being a good problem solver is important.
Tough Kid (Sheridan, 1996)	Gives a purpose for learning the skills. However, if the child is not interested in making/keeping friends, the necessary motivation may not be present.	The children are told that the lessons are to teach them 1) how to get along better with others and 2) how to make and keep friends.	Before/during the modeling of skills portion of the lesson, the instructor defines the skill and discusses the importance	At the beginning of each lesson, time is spent discussing the skill's importance in everyday life. This sets the stage for the rest of the lesson. Also, examples used are to be chosen from real-life examples offered by the students.
Skillstreaming (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997)	The purpose of Skillstreaming is initially explained when first meeting with children individually.	See previous box (Step 1)	The instructor begins with the importance of the group and introduces the skill lesson to be taught.	See previous boxes.

Table 2. A cognitive-social learning model of social-skills training (Ladd & Mize, 1983)
(Enhancing skill concepts - step 1, con't)

Program	B) Defining the skill concept in terms of attributes	• Conveying concept meaning – make sure the child understands the skill concepts being taught	• Explicitly identify relevant and irrelevant attributes – this eliminates the need for the child to infer the concept meaning	C) General exemplars • Identifying positive and negative examples – this prevents over-and under-generalization
ICPS (Shure, 1992)	The pre-problem solving vocabulary helps ensure that the child has the proper words/ language/ vocabulary to understand the later concepts. However, no assessment is done to ensure that everyone "gets it" (lack of treatment integrity).	This is mentioned in the Dialoguing that the words used should be within the child's vocabulary.	This is covered in the pre-problem solving vocabulary (e.g., explains a concept by what it *is* and what it *is not*).	Dialoguing – this is more indirect because the examples are not necessarily explicit.
Tough Kid (Sheridan, 1996)	This occurs at the beginning of each lesson and as part of the lesson.	Time at the beginning of each lesson is spent clarifying what is meant by the skill (e.g., what does problem solving mean?)	This is built into some lessons, but not all – the instructors can give/model non-examples to clarify the skill concepts.	Yes, explicitly stated as part of the modeling component. Part of learning "body basics." Incorporated into every lesson when explaining the skill.
Skillstreaming (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997)	The skill topic is introduced to the group and students are provided with an opportunity to explain what they think the topic might mean.	Yes. See previous box.	The instructor asks the group what types of skills are need to deal with a particular topic, and then identifies the skill steps to be learned.	Students are provided the opportunity to provide examples prior to the introduction of the actual skill steps that coincide with a lesson.

Table 2. A cognitive-social learning model of social-skills training (Ladd & Mize, 1983)
(Enhancing skill concepts - step 1, con't)

Program	D) Promoting rehearsal and recall of the skill concepts *Child gets to practice what was taught, gets evaluative praise and instructional feedback*	• Encouraging verbal rehearsal – this is better than covert rehearsal	• Establishing memory code – (e.g., use of mnemonic devices)	E) Refining and generalizing the concept	• Give corrective feedback – get the child to explain his/her understanding of the concept	• Identifying alternative applications
ICPS (Shure, 1992)	Examples given for skill concepts to be incorporated into daily lessons. Not explicit about every child practicing and how to evaluate their progress. Was intended to be more individualized.	The lessons come back to previous concepts, but this is not encouraged for individual children to do.	Not explicitly.	This is can be done if 1) the child participates and/or 2) instructor uses Dialoguing.	During the lesson this can occur if the child participates. This is also a part of Dialoguing (if used).	This can be done through Dialoguing (if used). Scripts are included for how to use the skill concepts within the classroom situation.
Tough Kid (Sheridan, 1996)	Posters of the weekly skill are hung to encourage students to remember the skills.	This is done using role plays.	Minimal – FEVER is the mnemonic to remember the "body basics."	Corrective feedback is explicitly part of the program. However, the other aspects are not as explicit, and could be included if the instructor chooses.	Corrective feedback is given during role plays. However, it's not specified that the child should explain his/her understanding of concept based on the feedback.	This could be done when homework is assigned, however, not explicitly included.
Skillstreaming (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997)	This is a major aspect of Skillstreaming as it is partially based on Bandura's Social Learning Theory.	Each student is expected to participate in a role play utilizing the new skill steps.	Students are provided several opportunities to verbally review the skill steps to encourage over-learning.	This is an important aspect of Skillstreaming.	Each child, as well as the instructor, is expected to provide feedback regarding the role-play.	Each child is to contribute an example of when and where the skill could be applied.

Table 2. A cognitive-social learning model of social-skills training (Ladd & Mize, 1983)
(Promoting skill performance – step 2)

Program	**Promoting Skill Performance (step 2)**– Child moves through successively more difficult skills. Going from contrived situation to more real life situations. Goes through role plays, first alone, then with peer, then practices skills in a non-lab context to go out and use this skills with other first.	**A) Providing opportunities for guided rehearsal**	• Requesting overt skill rehearsal	• Conducting rehearsals in a sheltered context
ICPS (Shure, 1992)	Focus is on mastery within the supportive environment where the skills are learned. The lessons progress from easy to more difficult. However, no structure exists for going from contrived to increasing more real life situations. It's either in the learning situation or in the real life classroom.	This depends on the class size and degree that each child can respond. This is a general weakness.	During the skill lesson, the children are all given opportunities to respond. But with a larger class size, each individual may not get time for practice of each skill.	This varies by number of children in the lesson and how it's set up. It doesn't seem to be set up as a sheltered environment. The teachers can follow scripts that encourage children to use skill concepts in classroom interactions. Children participate in role-plays within the context of some lessons.
Tough Kid (Sheridan, 1996)	Each lesson has the weekly review, instructing a new skill, modeling, role-play, feedback, and goal setting.	Very important portion due to the role-plays.	Practice of skills occurs during the role-plays.	In the small group format, the role-plays, semi-structured play, and modeling are key.
Skillstreaming (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997)	Children first learn the skills within the group, but are assigned weekly homework assignments to practice the skills in real life situations.	After the steps to a skill are reviewed, the instructors first model the steps and then provide the students with an opportunity to do so.	Each child is expected to participate in the role-plays.	Children conduct role-plays in a small, highly structured group.

Table 2. A cognitive-social learning model of social-skills training (Ladd & Mize, 1983)
(Promoting skill performance - step 2, con't)

Program	B) Evaluation of performance by the instructor	• Communicating performance standards by instructor	• Providing feedback about the match between standards and performance (the discrepancy is motivation to change)	C) Fostering skill refinement and elaboration • Recommending corrective action including concept reformulating and skill modification
ICPS (Shure, 1992)	Indirectly, through Dialoguing (e.g., "Is that a good place to . . . ?"). During the lesson, if the child volunteers to talk.	Dialoguing – if child's first problem-solving fails, teacher Dialogues with the child to identify the problem, generate solutions, explore consequences, and choose the best solution. If the child participates, he/she should receive feedback during lesson. Teachers can use scripts for giving feedback.	Teacher has script to correct and redirect, but usually just once (not necessarily until mastered).	Teacher has script to correct and redirect, but this usually just happens once.
Tough Kid (Sheridan, 1996)	This is done during role-plays. Peer feedback is also encouraged.	Very explicit that corrective feedback be given throughout the role-plays.	During the role-plays. When goals/contracts are evaluated to determine if the goals were accomplished.	During the role-plays, the instructor is supposed to stop the student as soon as an inappropriate action is demonstrated. Not explicit about corrective action.
Skillstreaming (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997)	This occurs after role-plays.	The instructor provides clear feedback regarding each child's role-play. Children in the group are also given the opportunity to provide feedback.	The instructor provides clear feedback in order for overlearning occur.	During the feedback, the group members and the instructor can recommend corrective action if a child does not incorporate the skill steps being taught.

Table 2. A cognitive-social learning model of social-skills training (Ladd & Mize, 1983)
(Fostering skill maintenance/generalization - step 3, con't)

Program	C) Fostering self-evaluation and skills adjustment	• Adoption of nondefeating self-attributions and affective states	• Use of information from self-monitoring to modify performance
ICPS (Shure, 1992)	Weakness of this program.	No.	No.
Tough Kid (Sheridan, 1996)	Weakness of this program.	No.	No.
Skillstreaming (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997)	This is an important aspect of Skillstreaming, although the steps are not exactly the same	Not explicitly.	The children can review their self-appraisals with their instructors to learn how they can improve.

Figure 1.

Adelman's (1996)
Comprehensive full service model

Student and family assistance	Support for transitions	Crisis/ emergency assistance and prevention	**Classroom Focused Enabling**	Home involvement and schooling	Community outreach/ volunteers

Ladd & Mize (1983)

Social-cognitive learning model

A) Enhancing skill concepts	B) Promoting skill performance	C) Fostering skill maintenance/ generalization

Elias & Clabby (1992)

Social decision-making and problem solving skills for social skill training

A) Self-control skills	B) Social awareness and group participation skills	C) Social decision-making and problem-solving skills

Programs

1) Interpersonal Cognitive Problem Solving (ICPS) kindergarten and primary grades (Shure, 1992)

2) The Tough Kid – Social Skills Book:
Part of the "Tough Kid" Series by Rhode, Jenson, & Reavis (Sheridan, 1996)

3) Skillstreaming in the elementary school child (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1997)